



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,351	08/01/2003	Patrick G. L. Perdu	690-011194-US (PAR) / D/A	3713
2512	7590	11/26/2007	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			DICKERSON, CHAD S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/633,351	PERDU, PATRICK G. L.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chad Dickerson	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/14/2007, with respect to the specification objections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of the specification have been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/14/2007, with respect to the claim objection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claim 10 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/14/2007, with respect to the 101 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 101 rejections of claims 14-17 have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Claim 6, the rejection is maintained. The claim language states "transporting the information device with the printed media to an offline post processing system". The reference of Murata is used to read on the language of transporting the information device with the media to an offline post-processing device. The media is not printed as the rejection of the claim shows. The reference of Webster cures this deficiency by having the printed media in the system transported to the offline finishing devices. In the system of Webster, a user is able to communicate with the Mark Facility Controller, which is able to have the print job that is printed to be feed to a finisher for finishing. The information relating to the finishing is accompanied with the print job that

is printed. This is an example of transporting information with printed media to an offline finisher (see col. 6, lines 46-65, col. 7, line 51 - col. 9, line 64 and col. 10, line 46 - col. 12, line 25). Therefore, in light of the reasoning above the rejection of claim 6 below is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley '727 (US Pat No 5193727) in view of Allen (US Pat No 6549299).

Re claim 1: Crowley '727 discloses a system for incorporation of post-production operations to a web output from an image transfer device comprising:

accumulating post processing instructions for printed media during printing operations (i.e. the determination system (44) is fed information as to the page, which has an image due to previous printing operations, should contain a post-processing operation. The feeding of information as to which page should receive post-processing is analogous to accumulating post processing for printed media; see fig. 1; col. 4, lines 5-57);

recording the post processing instructions on an information device (i.e. the determining means (44) has a register means that is able to store information related to

a data value representative of a post-production operation to be performed upon the web. The recording of the post processing instructions is analogous to the storing of the post processing instructions; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 58-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5);

transporting the information with the printed media from an online printing/copying system where the printing operations occur to a separate offline post processing system where the post processing occurs (i.e. while the web is fed to the image transferring device, it is transported to the post-processing device along the intermediate loop (74). Also, information regarding the web is also transported to the determination unit (44) and assists the post-production system to determine the period in which the page in which post-processing should occur in the post-processing device (48). Since the post-processing device and the image transfer device are not directly connected, the two devices are considered as separate; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5); and

playing back the post processing instructions at the offline post processing system for controlling offline post processing of the printed media (i.e. the post processing operation instruction is presented, or commanded, to the post-processing device to perform a desired operation to a certain page in the web. Since the post-processing device (48) is separated from the image transfer device (40), the post-processing device is considered to be offline. This is analogous to playing back the post processing instruction at the post processing device for controlling offline post

Art Unit: 2625

processing of the printed media; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

However, Crowley '727 fails to teach transporting the information device with the printed media.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Allen '299. Allen '299 discloses transporting the information device with the printed media (i.e. Allen '299 discloses a computer-readable instruction sheet containing computer-readable finishing instructions regarding the document or documents that are to be assembled and finished. The barcode (38) on the computer-readable instruction sheet is used to store the finishing details. The computer-readable instruction sheet with the barcode having the finishing details is considered to be the information device that is used to store the post-processing information. This sheet is transported with the document or documents to be finished or post-processed; see figs. 1, 2 and 6; col. 3, line 2 - col. 4, line 40 and col. 7, lines 2-42).

Therefore, in view of Allen '299, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of transporting the information device with the printed media in order to have an instruction sheet that accompanies a document sheets specifying the parameters related to finishing (as stated in Allen '299 col. 1, line 61 - col. 2, line 21).

Re claim 5: The teachings of Crowley '727 in view of Allen '299 are disclosed above.

Crowley '727 discloses the method, wherein playing back the post processing instructions comprises:

conveying the post processing instructions from the information device through a link to a post processing system (i.e. the determination device (44), analogous to the information device, conveys the post-processing instructions to the post-processing device (48). Although a link is not specifically disclosed in conveying the instructions, the instructions are conveyed between the two devices in a manner of communication that performs the function of a link; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5); and

routing the post processing instructions to one or more post processing modules for performing the offline post processing (i.e. the post-processing device receives the instructions and performs the operation of post-processing to the document that is indicated for post-processing. In this example, only one post-processing device is used, however, there can be a plurality of post-processing devices used in the system; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67; col. 5, lines 1-5 and col. 7, lines 1-13).

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crowley '727, as modified by Allen '299, and further in view of Webster '606 (US Pat No 5559606).

Re claim 3: The teachings of Crowley '727 in view of Allen '299 are disclosed above.

Crowley '727 discloses the method, wherein accumulating post processing instructions comprises compiling post processing instructions from a printing module (i.e. the determination unit (44) obtains signals from the image forming device (40) signaling a post-processing operation to occur to a page being passed through the system on the web; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

However, Crowley '727 in view of Allen '299 fails to teach compiling post-processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses compiling post-processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules (i.e. from various outside sources, jobs indicating several finishing or post-processing procedures are gathered by the marking modules and eventually sent to the respective post-processing devices in the system. The finishing modules gather the post-processing instructions from the marker or printer modules. Gathering the instructions is analogous to compiling the post-processing instructions; see col. 5, lines 54-66 and col. 6, lines 1-45).

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to compile post-processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules in order to coordinate the machine modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 1-45).

Re claim 4: The teachings of Crowley '727 in view of Allen '299 are disclosed above.

Crowley '727 discloses the method, wherein recording the post processing instructions comprises:

conveying the accumulated post processing instructions (i.e. in the system, the post-processing instructions are conveyed to the determination unit (44) in order to assist the post-processing device (48) in performing the post-processing operation; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5); and

recording the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device (i.e. the post-processing instructions are recorded or stored on the determination device, which is analogous to the information device. The data (54) sent from the image transfer device (40) to the determination device (44) is transmitted through a means of communication, this means of communication may not specifically be called a link, but the communication between the two devices functions as a link; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

However, Crowley '727 in view of Allen '299 fails to teach conveying the accumulated post processing instructions to a plurality of printing modules.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses conveying the accumulated post processing instructions to a plurality of printing modules (i.e. in the system, a plurality of devices convey post processing instructions to marking modules or printing modules; see col. 5, lines 54-66 and col. 6, lines 1-45).

Art Unit: 2625

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to convey the accumulated post processing instructions to a plurality of printing modules in order to coordinate the machine modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 1-45).

8. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata '028 in view of Webster '606.

Re claim 6: Murata '028 discloses an offline print method for printing image data in a removable storage medium based on output control data in the same medium comprising:

accumulating post processing instructions for printed media (i.e. using the user's computer in the system, post processing instructions are gathered, or accumulated, to operate the image forming apparatus when using the storage medium for printing in the system; see fig. 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49);

recording the post processing instructions on an information device (i.e. recording or storing the post processing instructions in the removable storage medium is performed on the user's computer; see fig. 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49);

transporting the information device with the media to an offline post processing system (i.e. the removable storage medium, with the image data stored therein, is taken, or transported, to the image forming device in order to be installed into the printer

for the image data stored to be printed offline in a desired form; see fig. 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49); and

playing back the post processing instructions for controlling offline post processing of the printed media (i.e. the image data and output control method stored on the removable storage medium presents, or plays back, the post processing instructions to the image forming apparatus for controlling the offline printing and post processing of the printed media. At this point, the media is printed and is ready for post processing; see fig. 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-67 and col. 11, lines 1-13).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach accumulating post processing instructions for printed media from a plurality of printing modules and transporting the information with the printed media.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses accumulating post processing instructions for printed media from a plurality of printing modules (i.e. from various outside sources, jobs indicating several finishing or post-processing procedures are gathered by the Mark Facility and eventually sent to the respective post-processing devices in the system. The finishing modules gather the post-processing instructions from the marker or printer modules. Gathering the instructions is analogous to compiling the post-processing instructions; see col. 5, lines 54-66 and col. 6, lines 1-45) and transporting the information with the printed media (i.e. the sheets, once printed out by the printer engine, can be transferred from the printer engine to the finishing devices. In the system of Webster, a user is able

to communicate with the Mark Facility Controller, which is able to have the print job that is printed to be feed to a finisher for finishing. The information relating to the finishing is accompanied with the print job that is printed. This is an example of transporting information with printed media to an offline finisher (see col. 5, lines 28-33, col. 6, lines 46-65, col. 7, line 51 - col. 9, line 64 and col. 10, line 46 - col. 12, line 25).

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to accumulate post processing instructions for printed media from a plurality of printing modules and transport the information with the printed media in order to coordinate the machine modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 1-45).

9. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata '028, as modified by Webster '606, and further in view of Crowley '727.

Re claim 7: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Webster '606 are disclosed above.

Webster '606 teaches the method, wherein recording the post processing instructions comprises: conveying the accumulated post processing instructions to an individual one of the plurality of printing modules (i.e. in the system, a plurality of devices convey post processing instructions to marking modules or printing modules; see col. 5, lines 54-66 and col. 6, lines 1-45).

However, Murata '028 in view of Webster '606 fails to teach recording the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses recording the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device (i.e. the post-processing instructions are recorded or stored on the determination device, which is analogous to the information device. The data (54) sent from the image transfer device (40) to the determination device (44) is transmitted through a means of communication, this means of communication may not specifically be called a link, but the communication between the two devices functions as a link; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to record the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device in order to store data representing a post-production operation (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 4, lines 5-67).

Re claim 8: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Webster '606 are disclosed above.

However, Murata '028 in view of Webster '606 fails to teach the method, wherein playing back the post processing instructions comprises: conveying the post processing instructions from the information device through a link to the post processing system;

and routing the post processing instructions to one or more post processing modules for performing the offline post processing.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses the method, wherein playing back the post processing instructions comprises:

conveying the post processing instructions from the information device through a link to the post processing system (i.e. the determination device (44), analogous to the information device, conveys the post-processing instructions to the post-processing device (48). Although a link is not specifically disclosed in conveying the instructions, the instructions are conveyed between the two devices in a manner of communication that performs the function of a link; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5); and

routing the post processing instructions to one or more post processing modules for performing the offline post processing (i.e. the post-processing device receives the instructions and performs the operation of post-processing to the document that is indicated for post-processing. In this example, only one post-processing device is used, however, there can be a plurality of post-processing devices used in the system; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67; col. 5, lines 1-5 and col. 7, lines 1-13).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to convey the post processing instructions from the information device through a link to the post processing system and route the post processing instructions to one or more post processing modules for performing the

offline post processing in order to instruct the post-production device to perform an operation (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 4, lines 5-67; col. 5, lines 1-5).

10. Claims 9, 13, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata '028 (US Pat No 7054028) in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299.

Re claim 9: Murata '028 discloses an offline print method for printing image data in a removable storage medium based on output control data in the same medium comprising:

an online printing/copying operation having a controller for determining post processing instructions for printed media (i.e. the printer/copier in the system has a controller (85) that is able to determine the post processing instructions for printed media that are installed in the PC card slot (89) through the removable storage medium; see figs. 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49) and for recording the post processing instructions on an information device (i.e. the output control data relating to the finishing operations, or post-processing, are stored on a removable storage medium. The function of recording is analogous to the function of storing; see col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49); and

an post processing operation operable to play back the post processing instructions from the information device for controlling post processing of the printed media (i.e. the printer/copier with finishing capabilities are considered as an offline

printing function. A post-processing operations, or instructions, are able to be presented to the finishing device from the removable storage medium, for controlling the post-processing of the printed media; see col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach offline post processing and a holding device for conveying the printed media and the information together from the online printing/copying operation to the offline post processing operation.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses offline post processing (i.e. in the system of Crowley '727, since the post production device is a distance away from the image transfer device, this is considered to be offline post processing. Also, the system determines when the page is about to pass through the post-production device. With this determination, the page is conveyed along with the information regarding the post-production to the post-production device in order for a post-production operation to be performed on the print media. This performs the feature of the holding device that conveys the printed material; see col. 1, line 40 - col. 2, line 50 and col. 4, line 5 – col. 6, line 43).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have offline post processing and a holding device for conveying the printed media and the information together from the online printing/copying operation to the offline post processing operation in order to perform multiple types of post-production operations at various locations of the moving web (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 1, lines 40 – col. 2, line 49).

However, Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 fails to teach conveying the printed media and the information device together.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Allen '299. Allen '299 discloses conveying the printed media and the information device together (i.e. the printed media is conveyed, or transported, from the printing device to the offline finishing device, together with the instruction sheet or barcodes on each sheet that represent the information device. The instruction sheet or the barcodes on each sheet are considered as the information device since either element is used to have information to inform the finishing device the finishing operations to perform; see figs. 1, 2 and 6; col. 3, line 2 - col. 4, line 40 and col. 7, lines 2-42).

Therefore, in view of Allen '299, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of conveying the printed media and the information device together in order to have an instruction sheet that accompanies a document sheets specifying the parameters related to finishing (as stated in Allen '299 col. 1, line 61 - col. 2, line 21).

Re claim 13: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 are disclosed above.

Murata '028 discloses the printing system, wherein the offline post processing operation further comprises:

one or more post processing modules for performing the post processing (i.e. in the printer/copier system, there a post processing module that performs different features of post processing or finishing; see col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49);

a link, connected to at least one of the one or more post processing modules for playing back the post processing instructions for use by the one or more post processing modules (i.e. in the printer, there is a communication link that links the CPU (85) to the finisher, in order to instruct the finisher of what finishing operations to perform. When the removable storage medium is installed in the printer, the post-processing instructions are played back, or presented, to the finisher in order to control the finishing functions designated by the user; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach an offline post processing.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses offline post processing (i.e. in the system of Crowley '727, since the post production device is a distance away from the image transfer device, this is considered to be offline post processing. Also, the system determines when the page is about to pass through the post-production device. With this determination, the page is conveyed along with the information regarding the post-production to the post-production device in order for a post-production operation to be performed on the print media; see col. 1, line 40 - col. 2, line 50 and col. 4, line 5 – col. 6, line 43).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have offline post processing in order to

perform multiple types of post-production operations at various locations of the moving web (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 1, lines 40 – col. 2, line 49).

Re claim 14: Murata '028 discloses an offline print method for printing image data in a removable storage medium based on output control data in the same medium comprising:

a computer useable medium having computer readable code means embodied therein for causing a computer to print media (i.e. the CPU (85) contained in the printer causes the printer to print different types of images on media according to the input in the system; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49), the computer readable code means in the computer program product comprising:

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to accumulate post processing instructions (i.e. the CPU (85) accumulates post processing instructions from the removable storage memory device after the post-processing instructions are stored on the removable device and installed in the PC card slot (89) of the printer; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49);

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to record the post processing instructions on an information device (i.e. the user's computer records information regarding post-processing instructions on a removable storage device, which is analogous to an information device; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49); and

Art Unit: 2625

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to play back the post processing instructions for controlling post processing of the printed media (i.e. when the removable storage medium is installed in the PC card slot (89), the information for instructing post-processing is played back, or presented, in order to control the post processing of the printed media that is output from the printer; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach to accumulate post processing instructions for the printed media during printing operations and offline post processing.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses to accumulate post processing instructions for the printed media during printing operations (i.e. during the printing process, the post processing device receives or accumulates post-processing instructions for the printed media during printing from the determination device (44). The determination device (44) receives information from the image transfer device (40) that assists the determination device (44) when the post-processing should be performed; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5) and offline post processing (i.e. since the post-processing device is separate from the image forming device, this is considered as offline post processing; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to accumulate post processing instructions for the printed media during printing operations and have offline post processing in order to instruct the post-production device to perform an operation when data gathered

indicates such an action (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

However, Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 fails to teach after the information device together with the printed media has been transported from an online printing/copying system where the printing operation occurs to a separate offline post processing system where the offline post processing occurs.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Allen '299. Allen '299 discloses after the information device together with the printed media has been transported from an online printing/copying system where the printing operation occurs to a separate offline post processing system where the offline post processing occurs (i.e. in the system of Allen '299, the post processing operation occurs when the instruction sheet is transported to the finishing device with the document or documents, and the finishing device reads the instruction sheet to determine the finishing operations to be performed to the document or documents. The instruction sheet can consist of the sheet with a barcode or the actual document with barcodes on each sheet to inform the finishing device the process of finishing for each sheet; see figs. 1, 2 and 6; col. 3, line 2 - col. 4, line 40 and col. 7, lines 2-42).

Therefore, in view of Allen '299, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the post processing instructions be executed after the information device together with the printed media has been transported from an online printing/copying system where the printing operation occurs to a separate offline post processing system where the offline post processing occurs in

order to an instruction sheet that accompanies a document sheets specifying the parameters related to finishing (as stated in Allen '299 col. 1, line 61 - col. 2, line 21).

Re claim 16: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 are disclosed above. Murata '028 discloses the computer useable medium, wherein the computer readable program code means for causing a computer to record the post processing instructions (i.e. the user's computer records information regarding post-processing instructions on a removable storage device, which is analogous to an information device; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49) comprises:

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to convey the accumulated post processing instructions to an individual one of a plurality of printing modules (i.e. the user's computer conveys accumulated post processing instructions to an individual printing module through a removable storage medium that stores the post-processing instructions for the printer; see col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49); and

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to record the accumulated post processing instructions by way of the information device (i.e. the removable storage medium is used to record the accumulated post-processing instructions that will control the finishing output of the image data; see col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach causing a computer to record the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses causing a computer to record the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device (i.e. the determination device (44) has a means for recording, or storing, the accumulated post-processing instructions between the image transfer device (40), considered as the printing module, and the determination unit (44) with a storage device, considered in this example as a information device. Although a specific link is not disclosed, the communication between the two devices that signal to the determination device (44) to perform a post-processing function on a certain part of the web, functions as a link between the two devices. The communication between the devices performs the function of the link; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to cause a computer to record the accumulated post processing instructions by way of a link between the individual one printing module and the information device in order to be fed data that contains a post-processing operation (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 4, lines 5-67).

Re claim 17: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 are disclosed above.

Murata '028 discloses the computer program product, wherein the computer readable program code means for causing a computer to play back the post processing instructions media (i.e. when the removable storage medium is installed in the PC card slot (89), the information for instructing post-processing is played back, or presented, in order to control the post processing of the printed media that is output from the printer; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49) comprises:

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to convey the post processing instructions from the information device through a link to a post processing system (i.e. the removable storage medium is placed in the PC card slot (89) to convey the post processing instructions from the storage medium to the post processing, or finishing, system. The communication between devices in the system occurs through the CPU bus (83), which operates as a link between the storage medium, considered as the information device, and the printer shown in figure 1; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 3-49); and

computer readable program code means for causing a computer to route the post processing instructions to one or more post processing modules for performing the post processing (i.e. when the removable storage medium is in the PC card slot (89), the post-processing instructions are sent to the finisher to perform one of the many finishing functions performed by the finisher (222 or 221) in the system; see figs. 1 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35; col. 10, lines 3-67 and col. 11, lines 1-13).

However, Murata '028 fails to teach offline post processing.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Crowley '727. Crowley '727 discloses offline post processing (i.e. since the post-processing device is separate from the image forming device, this is considered as offline post processing; see fig. 1; col. 2, lines 24-49; col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

Therefore, in view of Crowley '727, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have offline post processing in order to have post-production device to perform a post-production operation (as stated in Crowley '727 col. 4, lines 5-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5).

11. Claims 11, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata '028, as modified by Crowley '727 and Allen '299, and further in view of Webster '606.

Re claim 11: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 are disclosed above.

However, Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 fails to teach the printing system, wherein the online printing/copying operation further comprises a plurality of printing modules, and the post processing instructions are compiled from each of the plurality of printing modules.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses wherein the online printing/copying operation further comprises a plurality of printing modules (i.e. in figure 3, a plurality of marking, or printing, modules are

disclosed. These marking modules are used to print images on paper feed to the marking modules; see col. 5, lines 54-66 and col. 6, lines 1-45), and the post processing instructions are compiled from each of the plurality of printing modules (i.e. in the prior art example, the finishing modules receive instruction from the marking modules. If the prior art used the plurality of marking modules in figure 3 to operate in the prior art system, the function of having multiple post-processing instructions gathered or compiled from the plurality of marking modules, or printing modules, will be performed; see figs. 2 and 3; col. 5, lines 16-66 and col. 6, lines 1-66).

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the online printing/copying operation further comprise a plurality of printing modules, and the post processing instructions to be compiled from each of the plurality of printing modules in order to coordinate the modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 26-35).

Re claim 12: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 and further in view of Webster '606 are disclosed above.

However, Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 fails to teach the printing system, further comprising: a final printing module where post processing instructions are accumulated from the plurality of printing modules and a link for recording the accumulated post processing instructions from the final printing module to the information device.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses the printing system, further comprising:

a final printing module where post processing instructions are accumulated from the plurality of printing modules (i.e. the print module, or marking module, receives requests or instructions for post processing to occur to the document currently being processed for printing. These requests are gathered, or accumulated, in order to be given to the finisher to instruct finishing functions; see col. 5, lines 16-53) and

a link for recording the accumulated post processing instructions from the final printing module to the information device (i.e. there is a visible link between the marking module and the finishing module. The marking module instructs the finishing module of the finishing tasks by a way of communication, although this manner of communication is not specified as a link. However, it is clearly seen how the invention describes how certain modules depend on the modules that precede others in the feeding, printing and finishing process. The control dependency is on the former device in the device order, which means that a marking device controls the finishing device based on the order of the neighboring module; see col. 5, lines 16-53).

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a final printing module where post processing instructions are accumulated from the plurality of printing modules and a link for recording the accumulated post processing instructions from the final printing module to the information device in order to coordinate the modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 26-35).

Re claim 15: The teachings of Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 are disclosed above.

Murata '028 discloses the computer program product, wherein the computer readable program code means for causing a computer to accumulate post processing instructions (i.e. the CPU (85) accumulates post processing instructions from the removable storage memory device after the post-processing instructions are stored on the removable device and installed in the PC card slot (89) of the printer; see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49) comprises computer readable program code means for causing a computer to compile post processing instructions (i.e. the printer's CPU (85) compiles, or gathers, post-processing instructions from the removable storage medium installed in the PC card slot (89); see fig. 1, 2 and 8; col. 3, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 34-49).

However, Murata '028 in view of Crowley '727 and Allen '299 fails to teach to compile post processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Webster '606. Webster '606 discloses to compile post processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules (i.e. in figure 3, with a plurality of marking, or printing modules, the finishing modules can gather, or compile, post-processing instructions from the marking modules in the system. In the prior art system, the marking modules convey the finishing instructions to the next module to perform the function. With figure 3 displaying a plurality of marking modules, the prior art system can use these modules to send post-

processing instructions to the next finishing module in the process; see figs. 2-4; col. 5, lines 15-53).

Therefore, in view of Webster '606, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to compile post processing instructions from each of a plurality of printing modules in order to coordinate modules to render a job (as stated in Webster '606 col. 6, lines 1-66).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Dickerson whose telephone number is (571)-270-

1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30 Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Aung Moe can be reached on (571)- 272-7314. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CD/ *ch*
Chad Dickerson
November 15, 2007

Aung S. Moe
AUNG S. MOE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
11/19/07